

**Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery****Intellectual Property Law**
1301 K. Street, NW, Suite 401L

Washington, D.C. 20006

Phone: (202) 419-7000 Fax: (202) 419-7007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 28 2005

TELECOPIER COVER SHEET

Client/Matter Nos: 77017

Date: October 28, 2005

The transmission that follows totals 5 pages, including this cover sheet. Please deliver immediately to the following:

Mail Stop AF

Art Unit: 1761

Confirmation No.: 6489

Fax: (571) 273-8300

Re: U.S. Application No.: 10/696,284
AKASHE, et al.

This transmission is being sent by ramon r. hoch, please call (202-419-7000) if there is a problem with this transmission.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 28, 2005.

Ramon R. Hoch

Ramon R. Hoch, Reg. No. 34,108

Attached Paper(s):

1) Statement of the Substance of the Interview (4 pages).

This transmission with its attachments is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is **PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this transmission in error, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. Please notify the operator immediately by telephone and mail the original telecopier message back to us. We will reimburse your first-class mail costs.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 28 2005

PATENT APPLICATION
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:) Confirmation No. 6489
AKASHE, ET AL.)
) Attny. Dkt.: 77017
)
Serial No.: 10/696,284) Group Art Unit: 1761
)
Filed: October 29, 2003) Examiner: Weier, Anthony J.
)
For:)
METHOD OF PREPARATION OF)
HIGH QUALITY SOY CULTURED)
PRODUCTS)

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Sir:

This is responsive to the Official Action dated October 11, 2005, including an Interview Summary (form PTOL-413), and indicating applicants had a one month period of response in which to file a statement of the substance of the interview held between Applicants' undersigned representative and the examiner of record, Examiner Weier, on October 5, 2005.

Applicants' statement of the substance of the interview of October 5, 2005, is as follows:

1) *Terminal Disclaimers*

As discussed during the interview of October 5, 2005, Applicants' representative confirmed that appropriate Terminal Disclaimers had been filed on September 29, 2005 to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejections made in the final Office Action against instant claims 11-20 based on claims 12-22

U.S.S.N. 10/696,284

2

Atty. Dkt. No. 77017

Statement of Substance of Interview dated October 28, 2005

Reply to Official Action of October 11, 2005

and 24-28 of assignee's copending application No. 10/655,478, and claims 1-22 of assignee's copending application No. 10/655,259.

In a follow-up telephonic discussion initiated by the examiner of record on October 7, 2005, the examiner requested that applicant submit additional Terminal Disclaimers to avoid additional prospective obviousness-type double patenting rejections which he otherwise would impose relative to assignee's copending application nos. 10/755,210 and 10/696,603. As indicated by examiner, these additional obviousness-type double-patenting rejections were considered appropriate by him as the two above-mentioned copending applications 10/755,210 and 10/696,603 also set forth method claims including a recitation regarding conducting ultrafiltration "while maintaining the pH in the range of about 9 to about 12," which is also recited in the instant method claims and was a subject of discussion during the Interview in respect of the separate art-based rejection. It was agreed that additional obviousness-type double patenting rejections would not be appropriate or applied based on assignee's copending application nos. 10/696,636, 10/654,769, and 10/655,210, which currently have various product claims under examination. On October 11, 2005, applicants complied with the examiner's request of October 7, 2005 and submitted the additionally requested Terminal Disclaimers, and also petitioned for an additional (second) extension month for response on October 14, 2005 to ensure that the submissions made October 11, 2005 were deemed timely.

U.S.S.N. 10/696,284

3

Atty. Dkt. No. 77017

Statement of Substance of Interview dated October 28, 2005

Reply to Official Action of October 11, 2005

2) *The Obviousness Rejection*

Applicants' representative argued during the interview that a prima facie case of obviousness had not been made against instant Claims 11-20 based on the combination of Goodnight Jr. and Cole.

In particular, Applicants' representative pointed out that pending independent claim 11, and all its depending claims 12-20, recite, among other features, conducting ultrafiltration "while maintaining the pH in the range of about 9 to about 12."

Applicants' representative pointed out that the instant specification explains the significance of this recited feature of the claimed method at page 11, lines 30-32. It also was pointed out that Example 1 of the instant application demonstrates the unexpected results and criticality associated with this feature of discussion through comparative testing results.

Applicants' representative noted that Goodnight Jr. discloses, at col. 3, lines 39-42, conducting membrane filtration on a clarified extract that preferably is adjusted to a pH in the range of pH 6.5 to pH 7.5 prior to membrane filtration.

Applicants' representative also pointed out that Example 1 of Goodnight Jr. discloses that the extract charged to ultrafiltration process of that working example had a pH of 7.36, as indicated at col. 7, lines 21-23. It was noted by Applicants' representative that no ultrafiltration process pH value outside the 6.5 to 7.5 range was illustrated by Goodnight Jr.

Applicants' representative acknowledged that Goodnight Jr. also suggest that the 5.5 to 7.5 pH range for ultrafiltration "is not essential" at col. 3, lines 41-42, but that Goodnight Jr. provided no enabling disclosure or other guidance for practicing ultrafiltration outside the 6.5 to 7.5 pH range.

U.S.S.N. 10/696,284 4 Atty. Dkt. No. 77017
Statement of Substance of Interview dated October 28, 2005
Reply to Official Action of October 11, 2005

Moreover, Applicants' representative pointed out that Goodnight Jr. expressly teaches away from using a pH other than 6.5 to 7.5 during ultrafiltration at col. 3, lines 42-46.

The examiner did not agree to indicate any allowance at the conclusion of the interview. However, the understanding of applicants' representative was that applicants' arguments were deemed promising by the examiner towards possibly advancing this case to allowance, but that the examiner's reconsideration and decision on patentability was subject to the examiner's completion of his review of Applicant's written response filed September 29, 2005, internal disposition at the US PTO of the submitted terminal disclaimers, and review of possibly related copending applications.

It is believed that the above represents an accurate record of the interview of interest.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Date: October 28, 2005

By: Ramon R. Hoch
Ramon R. Hoch
Reg. No. 34,108

120 South LaSalle Street
Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: (312) 577-7000
Facsimile: (312) 577-7007